1 2 3 4 5 6	Andrew C. Lauersdorf, WSBA #35418 E-mail: acl@mlrlegalteam.com Janis C. Puracal, WSBA #39234 E-mail: jcp@mlrlegalteam.com MALONEY LAUERSDORF REINER, PC 1111 E. Burnside St., Ste. 300 Portland, OR 97214 Telephone: (503) 245-1518 Facsimile: (503) 245-1417 Attorneys for Plaintiff Perienne de Jara	y	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8			
9	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
10	AT SI	AT SEATTLE	
10	PERIENNE DE JARAY,	No.: 2:16-cv-00571	
11	Plaintiff,	No.: 2:10-cv-005/1	
12	V.	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR	
13	ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA	EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO	
14	FOR HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN, CANADIAN BORDER SERVICES	DISMISS PENDING RULING ON MOTION FOR DISCOVERY	
	AGENCY, GLOBAL AFFAIRS CANADA fka DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL	NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:	
16 17	TRADE CANADA, GEORGE WEBB, KEVIN VARGA, and PATRICK LISKA,	FRIDAY, OCTOBER 14, 2016	
18	Defendants.		
19			
	I. RELIEF REQUESTED		
20	Plaintiff Perienne de Jaray requests the Court extend the deadline to		
21	respond to Defendants' motion to dismiss pending the Court's ruling on		
22	Plaintiff's motion for discovery.		
23	Fiantin's motion for discovery.		
24	II. STATEMENT OF FACTS		
25			
26	Defendants filed their motion to dismiss on September 29, 2016.		
Page	e 1- PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND		

Page 1- PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS PENDING RULING ON MOTION FOR DISCOVERY

MALONEY | LAUERSDORF | REINER REINER

Plaintiff's response is due by October 17. In their motion, Defendants request that the Court dismiss this case for lack of jurisdiction and based on the doctrines of *forum non conveniens*, "act of state," and "international comity." Defendants base their arguments on the unsupported assertions that the wrongful conduct occurred in Canada and that all witnesses are located in Canada.²

Plaintiff's damage did not arise solely out of the wrongful conduct in Canada. The cause of Plaintiff's damage was the Defendants' wrongful actions taken to involve U.S. law enforcement—including the FBI and the U.S. Attorney's Office in Seattle—and to conduct an investigation on U.S. soil, which largely occurred in Washington State. Defendants now argue that it would be inconvenient and improper to answer for that conduct in a U.S. court in Washington State.

Plaintiff is preparing her motion for leave to seek discovery necessary to respond to Defendants' factual assertions about the location of the wrongful conduct and the witnesses involved. Plaintiff will file her motion within one week.

Because that motion will not be decided before the deadline to respond to the motion to dismiss, Plaintiff files this motion to extend the deadline to respond.

III. ISSUE PRESENTED

Should the Court extend the deadline to respond to Defendants' motion

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

¹ Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Complaint at pp. 20-24 [Dkt. No. 22].

² *Id*.

to dismiss pending the Court's ruling on Plaintiff's motion for discovery?

2

1

3

5

7

9

8

11

12 13

1415

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

26

IV. ANALYSIS

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1) permits the Court to extend a deadline for "good cause" shown. Local Rule 7(j) provides that a party should request relief from a deadline "sufficiently in advance of the deadline to allow the court to rule on the motion prior to the deadline."

Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, Defendants filed their motion to dismiss on September 29 and noted the motion for consideration on October 21. Plaintiff's response is due by October 17. Plaintiff, however, requires additional information to respond to Defendants' arguments related to *forum non conveniens*, "act of state" doctrine, and "international comity" doctrine.

Pursuant to this Court's order,³ Plaintiff is preparing her motion for leave to seek discovery and will file that motion within one week. Plaintiff requests the Court extend the deadline to respond to Defendants' motion to dismiss pending the Court's ruling on Plaintiff's motion for discovery.

V. CONCLUSION

Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court extend the deadline to respond to the motion to dismiss pending the Court's ruling on Plaintiff's motion for discovery.

³ Order Denying Plaintiff's Motion for FRCP 16 Conference at p.3 ("Plaintiff has failed to make a showing that discovery is needed to respond to the as-yet-unfiled Rule 12 motion, but Plaintiff may move at a later date to request that discovery and an extension of the deadline to respond to the Rule 12 motions.") [Dkt. No. 21].

DATED: October 6, 2016 MALONEY LAUERSDORF REINER, PC By <u>/s/ Andrew C. Lauersdorf</u> Andrew C. Lauersdorf, WSBA #35418 E-Mail: acl@mlrlegalteam.com Janis C. Puracal, WSBA #39234 E-Mail: jcp@mlrlegalteam.com Attorneys for Plaintiff Perienne DeJaray